

```
QUIN DENVIR, Bar #49374
 1
    Federal Defender
    MARK J. REICHEL, Bar #155034
    Assistant Federal Defender
3
    801 I Street, 3rd Floor
    Sacramento, California 95814
    Telephone: (916) 498-5700
4
5
    Attorney for Defendant
    ENZOR HENDERSON
6
7
                       IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
                     FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9
10
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
11
                                       NO. CR.S-04-326-GEB
                   Plaintiff,
12
                                       STIPULATION OF THE PARTIES FOR A
                                       RETURN TO COURT DATE; ORDER ON
         V.
13
                                       EXCLUSION OF TIME
14
    ENZOR HENDERSON,
                                       Date: March 3, 2006
15
                    Defendant.
                                        Time: 9:00 a.m.
                                        Judge: Hon. Garland E. Burrell
16
         IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties hereto through
17
    their respective counsel, KYMBERLY SMITH, Assistant United States
18
    Attorney, attorney for Plaintiff, MARK J. REICHEL, Assistant Federal
19
    Defender, attorney for Defendant, that the status conference hearing
20
    date of January 27, 2005 shall be vacated. This court previously
21
    ordered the preparation of a Pre Plea Presentence Investigation and
22
             The report has been prepared and the parties further stipulate
23
    to a return to court on the date of March 3, 2006 for a change of plea.
```

The parties advise the court that they are in good faith negotiations to resolve the case at present. The specifics of the case and the defendant's prior criminal history make the negotiations and possible prediction of the likely consequences of a guilty plea

24

25

26

27

28

difficult. An investigation and report back to the parties from the probation department would greatly assist the parties in their effort to resolve the case, as the parties would have a reliable answer from a competent source. The report has now added some certainty to the parties attempts to resolve the case.

Accordingly, all counsel and the defendant agree that the time under the Speedy Trial Act from the date this stipulation is lodged, through March 3, 2006, should be excluded in computing the time within which trial must commence under the Speedy Trial Act, pursuant to Title

under the Speedy Trial Act from the date this stipulation is lodged, through March 3, 2006, should be excluded in computing the time within which trial must commence under the Speedy Trial Act, pursuant to Title 18 pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(H)(1)(I) delay resulting from consideration by the Court and its Probation Office of the proposed plea agreement.

Respectfully submitted,

QUIN DENVIR Federal Public Defender

DATED: February 17, 2006

/s/ MARK J. REICHEL
MARK J. REICHEL
Assistant Federal Defender
Attorney for Defendant

McGREGOR SCOTT United States Attorney

/s/ MARK J. REICHEL for
KIMBERLY SMITH
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Attorney for Plaintiff

22 DATED: February 17, 2006

IT IS SO ORDERED. Time under the Speedy Trial Act is excluded in the interests of justice and the hearing continued for the reasons set forth herein above and for the dates and times set forth therein pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. § 3161(H)(1)(I) delay resulting from consideration by the Court and its Probation Office of the proposed plea agreement.

Dated: March 10, 2006

/s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr. GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR. United States District Judge